

REMARK/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4, and 6-22 are presently active; Claims 9, 10, 13, 14, 17, 18, 21, and 22 have been amended by the present amendment.

Claims 9, 13, 17, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Claims 10, 14, 18, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 4, 8-10, and 15-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,579,055 to Hamilton et al in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,147,714 to Terasawa et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,665,873) to Van Getsel et al, U.S. Pat. No. 5,940,073) to Klosterman et al (hereinafter Klosterman '073) and U.S. Pat. No. 5,550,576) to Klosterman (hereinafter Klosterman '576). Claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamilton et al, Terasawa et al, Van Getsel et al, Klosterman '073, and Klosterman '576 in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,559,548 to Davis et al. Claims 11-14 and 19-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al in view of Terasawa et al and Klosterman '073.

Regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101, Claims 9, 13, 17, and 21 have been amended to recite a computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program recognized in the M.P.E.P. § 2106 IV (B) (1) (a) as statutory. Thus, the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection has been overcome.

Regarding the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection, the present amendment amends the claims to recite features of only one statutory class. Accordingly, Applicants respectively submit that the claims are in compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second

Application Serial No: 09/114,352
Reply to Office Action dated December 29, 2005

paragraph, in that these claims particularly point out the subject matter of the claimed invention.

Regarding the rejection on the merits, the outstanding Office Action newly applies Van Getsel et al for a teaching of a broadcaster having a camera in which supplemental content is added to the signal such “as the vertical blanking interval.” However, the earliest U.S. filing date of Van Getsel et al is March 23, 1998 which does not antedate Applicants Japanese priority date of July 18, 1997. Accordingly, submitted herewith is a certified English translation of Japanese priority document P09-193589. Given Applicants previously submitted priority claim, acknowledged on the Official Filing Receipt, and given the filing of certified copy of Japanese priority document P09-193589 on July 13, 1998, Applicants submit that Van Getsel et al should be removed as prior art.

Hence, it is respectfully submitted that the independent Claims 1 and 8-22, and the claims dependent therefrom, patentably define over the prior art references of record.

Application Serial No: 09/114,352
Reply to Office Action dated December 29, 2005

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussions, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Registration No. 40,073
Attorney of Record
Ronald A. Rudder, Ph.D.
Registration No. 45,618

CUSTOMER NUMBER
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000

Fax: (703) 413-2220

BDL:RAR:clh

I:\ATTY\RAR\AMENDMENTS\203\S\203593US\32006AM.DOC